

REMARKS

Claims 1-7

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-7 ultimately depend. Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-2 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Giordano (5,572,729). Claims 3-4 and 6-7 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base claim.

With respect to the indefiniteness of claim 1, Applicant notes that what is meant here is that *look-ups* resolve to the temporary record. That is, *look-ups* to the data file are what resolve to the temporary record. To make this more clear, Applicant has substituted the words “are directed” in lieu of “resolve.” That is, look-ups (to the data file) are directed to the temporary record. Applicant is interested in getting this patent application allowed as quickly as possible. Therefore, if the Examiner still believes that claim 1 is indefinite, she is requested to contact Applicant’s representative, Mike Dryja, at the phone number listed below, so that this issue can be resolved. Applicant is potentially amenable to other amendments to claim 1 to render it definite to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

Next, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 4, and has cancelled claim 4, to overcome the prior art rejection under 35 USC 102(b). Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 5-7 that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 8-11

Claim 8 is an independent claim, from which claims 9-11 ultimately depend. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has further been

rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Giordano. Claims 9-11 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base claim.

Applicant has amended claim 8 so that the term “resolve” instead reads “are directed,” such that Applicant submits that claim 8 is definite for the reasons described above in relation to claim 1. As with claim 1, if the Examiner believes that claim 8 still is indefinite, she is encouraged to contact Applicant’s representative, Mike Dryja, as Applicant is amenable to potentially adding other language to claim 8 to render it definite to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 9, and has cancelled claim 9, to overcome the prior art rejection under 35 USC 102(b). Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 8, and claims 10-11 that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 12-14

Claims 12-14 have been allowed. However, claim 12 has also been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, due to the aforementioned inclusion of the term “resolve.” Claim 12 is an independent claim, from which claims 13-14 ultimately depend. As with the other independent claims, Applicant has amended claim 12 to instead use the terminology “are directed.” As such, Applicant submits that claim 12 is now definite, but as with the other independent claims, requests that the Examiner contact Applicant’s representative if she believes otherwise. Applicant thus submits that claims 12-14 are allowable.

Claims 15-17

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 16-17 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base claim. Claim 15 is an independent claim, from which claims 16-17 ultimately depend. Applicant has amended claim 15 in the same manner as the other independent claims to overcome the indefiniteness rejection, although as before Applicant is amenable to potentially

modifying claim 15 in a different way to satisfy the Examiner in this respect. As such, Applicant submits that claims 15-17 are allowable.

Claims 18-23

Claims 18-23 have been cancelled.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicants' Attorney, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. Applicant particularly requests that the Examiner call Mr. Dryja if there are any minor issues that can be resolved over the phone and/or by Examiner's amendment, instead of issuing another office action, so that this patent application can issue as a patent without undue delay. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



March 28, 2007
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 206-374-2819